

CONGRESS OF THE U. STATES.

Thirty-Third Congress—First Session.

THURSDAY, MAY 25, 1854.

[CONCLUDED.]

SENATE.

Mr. SUMNER having concluded his remarks, Mr. DOUGLASS replied to some of the arguments, which had been urged against the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, and the question being stated, "Shall the bill be read a third time?"

Mr. HUNTER called for the yeas and nays; which were ordered.

Mr. TOUCY said he desired to state, before the vote was taken, that he had received instructions from the legislature of his State to vote against the passage of the bill, but he deemed it his duty to disobey those instructions, and to obey the constitution of the United States, which he had sworn to support.

The question being taken by yeas and nays, resulted—yeas 35, nays 13—see below:

YEAS—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Benjamin, Brodhead, Brown, Butler, Cass, Clay, Dawson, Douglas, Fitzpatrick, Gwin, Hunter, Johnson, Jones of Iowa, Jones of Tennessee, Mallory, Mason, Morton, Norris, Pearce, Pettit, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Shields, Sill, Stuart, Thompson of Kentucky, Thompson of New Jersey, Toombs, Toucey, Waller, Williams, and Wright—35.

NAYS—Messrs. Allen, Bell, Chase, Clayton, Fish, Foot, Gillette, Hamlin, James, Seward, Sumner, Wade, and Walker—13.

So the bill was read a third time and passed. It being half past one o'clock, on motion, The Senate adjourned until Monday.

FRIDAY, MAY 26, 1854.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.
The House met at 12 o'clock, p.
Prayer by the chaplain of the House.
The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

REPORT ON THE UNITED STATES BANKS.
Mr. STANTON, of Kentucky, reported, from the Committee on Printing, a resolution for printing 1,500 extra copies of the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the condition of the banks of the United States, communicated to the House on the 11th instant, for the use of the Treasury Department.

The SPEAKER said, as the previous question had been seconded on the Senate amendments to the deficiency bill, the resolution could not be received except by unanimous consent.

The reception of the resolution was objected to.
Mr. WASHBURN, of Illinois, moved that when the House adjourn, it adjourn to meet on Monday next: agreed to—yeas 80, nays 28.

Mr. DRUM asked leave to offer a resolution to enable the several standing committees of the House having at this time in charge bills relating to private claims, of whatsoever kind, to report the same respectively, filing them with the clerk, who would place them in order on the calendar, to be printed.

Mr. JONES, of Tennessee, objected.
Mr. DRUM hoped the gentleman would withdraw his objection.

Mr. JONES said, for himself, he was willing to remain there and do the business.
Mr. DRUM reminded the gentleman that the resolution only related to reports already prepared.

Mr. HOUTSON said, for himself, he would sit to-morrow, they could have revised their reports.

WASHINGTON TERRITORY.
Mr. LANCASTER, on leave, introduced the following bill:

A bill for the establishment of the office of surveyor general in the Territory of Washington: referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill for the construction of military roads in the Territory of Washington: referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

THE DEFICIENCY BILL.
The House then proceeded to vote upon the amendments of the Senate to the deficiency bill.

The following amendments were concurred in by the vote attached to each:

For paying the expenses and additional outfit to J. B. Kerr, charged to Nicaragua, &c.—yeas 61, nays 61.

For completing, &c., the grounds south of the President's House, \$50,000, with the amendment of Mr. STANTON, of Kentucky, for additional iron settees in the President's and the Capitol grounds, \$1,000—yeas 53, nays 53.

For making the pay of the special mail agent in California \$5,000 per annum.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which this amendment was agreed to was laid on the table—yeas 81, nays 74.

The following amendments were non-concurred in by the House:

For expenses of explorations by Governor Stevens, \$40,000.

For the Washington aqueduct, \$500,000—yeas 47, nays 100.

For the bridge over the Potomac at Little Falls, \$75,000—yeas 44, nays 101.

For rent of paper ware-room, cartage of paper, &c., office of Superintendent of Public Printing, \$400.

For settling land claims in California, with \$5,000 for R. Greenhow, \$42,000.

For placing Michael Pappenzette, a subject of Austria, on the same footing with the subjects of Spain, in providing compensation for losses occasioned by violence at New Orleans and at Key Point.

For repealing the section of the present printing law, and directing the printing of the departments between the House and Senate printers equally—yeas 33, nays 102.

Providing for the completion of the custom-house at St. Louis, Mobile, Cincinnati, Louisville, Bangor, Bath, Wilmington, (Delaware), Providence, and San Francisco, \$1,110,000; and for marine hospitals at Cleveland, St. Louis, Chicago, Louisville, Paducah, Evansville, San Francisco, and Burlington, (Iowa), \$131,500—yeas 104, nays 164.

Mr. STANTON again offered his resolution for printing 1,500 extra copies of the report on the banks of the United States; pending which, at three o'clock,

The House adjourned until Monday next.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

FRIDAY, MAY 26, 1854.

Hon. Roland Jones, of Louisiana, was admitted an attorney and counselor of this court.

No. 83. Edwin Bartlett vs. George P. Kane. Error to the circuit court of the United States for Maryland. Mr. Justice Campbell delivered the opinion of this court, affirming the judgment of the said circuit court in this cause, with costs.

No. 112. Samuel H. Early vs. John Rogers, Jr., et al. Error to the circuit court of the United States for the western district of Virginia. Mr. Justice Campbell delivered the opinion of this court, affirming the judgment of the said circuit court in this cause, with costs.

No. 91. Wm. H. Seymour et al. vs. Cyrus H. McCormick. Error to the circuit court of the United States for the northern district of New York. Mr. Justice Grier delivered the opinion of this court, reversing the judgment of the said circuit court, with costs, and remanding the cause, with directions to award a venire facias de novo.

[The decision of the court reversing the judgment below was as to the ruling of said judge on a question of damages, the exceptions by plaintiffs in error to the ruling upon the patent having been overruled, and patent fully sustained.]

WASHINGTON CITY.

SATURDAY MORNING, MAY 27, 1854.

CONGRESS—FRIDAY.

The Senate did not sit to-day.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—Mr. LANCASTER introduced two bills relating to Washington Territory; which were appropriately referred. The House proceeded to vote upon the Senate amendments to the deficiency bill. Several more amendments were concurred in, and among those the House refused to concur in were those appropriating \$500,000 for the Washington aqueduct, \$75,000 for the bridge over the Potomac at Little Falls, and that for repealing the 7th section of the present printing law, and dividing the printing of the departments between the House and Senate printers. The amendment appropriating \$771,000 for the completion of custom-houses, and \$131,500 for the completion of marine hospitals, was also non-concurred in, there being a special bill on the calendar for these purposes. Pending a motion for the printing of extra copies of the annual report on banks, the House adjourned until Monday.

THE TRIUMPH COMPLETE—PASSAGE OF THE NEBRASKA BILL THROUGH THE SENATE!

The roar of cannon on Friday morning at one o'clock announced the close of a long and arduous session of the United States Senate, and the complete triumph of the Nebraska bill as it came from the House. As the deep tones of the iron-tongued thunderer wailed the echoes of the adjacent hills, they spoke also of the departure from the councils of the nation of those elements of discord and of irritation—the anti-slavery agitation and abolition excitement—opening for the future a clear and tranquil sky, and promising sunshine and peace for many, many years to come.

The vote upon the final passage of the Nebraska bill, minus the Clayton amendment, was even more decisive than when it was first carried. The following is the list of yeas and nays:

YEAS—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Benjamin, Brodhead, Brown, Butler, Cass, Clay, Dawson, Douglas, Fitzpatrick, Gwin, Hunter, Johnson, Jones of Iowa, Jones of Tennessee, Mallory, Mason, Morton, Norris, Pearce, Pettit, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Shields, Sill, Stuart, Thompson of Kentucky, Thompson of New Jersey, Toombs, Toucey, Waller, Williams, and Wright—35.

NAYS—Messrs. Allen, Bell, Chase, Clayton, Fish, Foot, Gillette, Hamlin, James, Seward, Sumner, Wade, and Walker—13.

The bill now goes for Franklin Pierce for its signature. That it will be promptly signed, it does not require us to say. The early, active, and enthusiastic support which he gave to this measure—his unflinching exertions in behalf of its great principle—his eloquent appeals to his party friends and to all those who desired his counsel—were in accordance with the consistent record of his career, and proved how well the democracy estimated moral courage and political consistency when they selected him as their standard-bearer. Never has he been known to flinch before a great issue. In Congress the opponent of corrupt legislation and loose expenditure—in New Hampshire the uncompromising foe of all sectionalism—in war the defender of his country's honor—and finally, in the presidential chair the embodiment of that deep and resistless sentiment which clings to the constitution as to the ark of our political safety, and deems it a first duty to fall in defense of its principles. Sustained by the able and experienced statesmen who compose his cabinet, and who have nobly co-operated with him in support of the Nebraska bill, the President may sign the bill with the proud consciousness that in doing so he follows his own early inclinations and wishes, at the same time that he responds to the action of the patriotic majority of the present Congress, and to the opinions of the American people, North and South.

THE NEBRASKA AND KANSAS BILL—WHO GAINS? AND WHO LOSES?

It is not always the case that a measure passes the national legislature which affects the American masses so favorably as the bill that has just passed Congress establishing the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas. As an evidence of this fact, observe the sudden termination of the excitement against that bill, connected in the great cities of the North by the abolitionists. That excitement grew up in a night, and perished in a day. As an answer to the calumnies and falsehoods of the abolitionists of Nebraska against the idea of popular sovereignty in the Territories, they themselves are now crying aloud that the people shall move into that region at once. But the Exodus had begun long before the bill had passed a single house. Among those, however, who will go forth to brave the perils of a pioneer life, we shall see few of the Mazzinian abolitionists of the North—the fungi of the great cities—the vermin that infest and deface society—the preachers of riot and of infidelity. They will linger in lazy vice in their favorite resorts, until some new occasion offers when they may wrong and traduce the country. The men who will go to the new Territories will come from all regions of the Union. The South, which has given so generously of her best blood to defend the integrity and the soil of that Union, will send freely of her young and ardent sons to the new field about to be opened to enterprise. The Northwest has her thousands waiting to go forward, and to renew there those scenes of frontier life, which have made that quarter of the country one great empire—the seat of commerce, of the arts, and of mechanical genius—which have made its population among the most steady and intelligent in the country. From the great States of the North—from Pennsylvania, the key of the arch—the tide of emigration will steadily move on. Thus has the excitement against Nebraska, started to dishonor the American name, ended by arousing our countrymen to the noble of the new regions soon to be organized, and in "crushing out" the last, and let us hope, futile, efforts of the fanatics of the day. Truly may it be said, that when the abolitionists lose, the people gain.

But there is another interest that gains vastly by this absolute settlement of the slavery agitation. Before the Nebraska bill was presented to Congress the democratic party was assailed by the most corrupt and selfish influence. Personal disappointments were eating out the vitality of our organization. A war of sections was threatened, and formidable combinations, based upon plausible prejudices, looked forward confidently to conquest over the administration of the President. Others, safe in their supposed identity with that administration, feared nothing so much as that test of principle which demands sincerity, because it requires sacrifice. At this moment Judge Douglas introduced his Nebraska bill. It was clamorously assailed, and at first a portion of the democratic column recoiled. But the truth soon became manifest, and daily the cause gathered strength, alike from the eloquence of its advocates and the madness and intimidations of its foes. Mere professions were tried and found valueless. To the courage of men the touchstone of principle was applied, and it was found that some who were loudest to promise were weakest and slowest to perform. The democratic majority in both houses of Congress took up the measure, and, aided by a body of sterling patriots from the southern States, passed it, after a struggle of unprecedented violence and rancor on the part of the abolitionists and their allies. The contest is now over, and the democratic party once more stands forth, its grand proportions fully developed, and its noble crest brighter and stronger from the conflict through which it has passed!

The gain, fellow-countrymen, is with advocates of the constitution; the loss, with the sworn foes of American liberty.

A BEAUTIFUL INCIDENT.

The discussion upon the Nebraska bill has been marked by a number of striking and significant passages of eloquence—among others, that between Senator Benjamin, of Louisiana, and an abolition senator, last Thursday evening in the Senate, will long be remembered. The latter, feeling that the Nebraska bill was sure to pass after midnight, and early on Friday morning, declared, in his speech against the measure, that it was that such a deed should be consummated on the day when the sun is to be shrouded in gloom—alluding to yesterday's eclipse—and when the American continent is covered with darkness.

The eloquent senator from Louisiana, Mr. Benjamin, in his reply, which came directly afterwards, met the appeal of the abolition senator in a most classic and effective manner, and with great animation and beauty. "I say to that senator," he remarked, "that whether this Nebraska bill pass or not, the laws of Nature will operate unintercepted, and whether we adjourn or not, the calculations of science will be realized. And let me add that the darkness to which he alludes will be a temporary darkness only. In a few short hours the obscurity will pass off, and then we shall once more enjoy perfect day—once more will the effulgence of the orb of light bless the land, and, like the genius of our institutions, all our citizens will rejoice in his glorious beams." At this moment—the senator spoke in the dusk of the evening—the splendid chandelier of the Senate was suddenly lighted up, and the unconscious illustration of his beautiful figure was so apposite, yet so unexpected, that the Senate and the galleries broke out into spontaneous applause. The scene itself cannot be described; and the eloquent senator from Louisiana, who does not speak often, will never have a better opportunity to show his rare skill as a rhetorician.

WHO WILL OPPOSE A GREAT PRINCIPLE?

Some of the opponents of the great principle of the Nebraska bill confined themselves, before it passed both houses of Congress, to the point that they only remonstrated against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and that, if the principle of allowing the people of the Territories to manage their own affairs in their own way, under the constitution, were presented to them *de novo*, they would advocate it with enthusiasm. We propose to take such men at their word. The Nebraska bill has passed. In a few days it will become a law. The Missouri Compromise has been declared to be "inoperative." The idea of advocating the Missouri Compromise is already impracticable. The idea of acquiescing in the action of Congress on that subject, on the other hand, is eminently practical. So, too, the advocacy of the great principle of popular sovereignty in the Territories. Here is a plain issue. Those who are honestly for a great living principle will now rejoice to signalize their sincerity by sustaining the Nebraska bill, or by acquiescing in it, now that it is about to become a law of the land. Those who are resolved to be factious, and who desire to defeat the democratic party, and who seek to promote corrupt ends by bad means, will join the abolitionists and northern whigs, and clamor about the repeal of a solemn compact, and the folly of allowing the people to rule.

LEWIS CASS.

The veteran senator from Michigan spoke on Thursday night in the Senate, in favor of the Nebraska bill, with a vigor worthy of his best days. His allusions to the course and to the argument of Col. Benton, on the same question, were distinguished not only by rare eloquence, but in point of genuine humor and good temper have rarely been equalled even in that eminent body of statesmen. He recalled the earlier, and may we not say, the better, days of the republic, and proved, by his devotion to a great principle, and by his fearless criticism upon one who had gone out from his old friends to unite with his former enemies, how ardently he cherished the party of the constitution. Never before has the gallant and learned senator from Michigan proved himself more worthy of the affectionate confidence of the democracy of the Union. We hope to print his speech in a few days.

VOICE FROM NEW HAMPSHIRE.

The sentiments of the extract below from the Keene Republican, a brave and steadfast defender of our faith in the third congressional district of New Hampshire, are so wise, so just, so wide in their application, that we transfer them to our columns. The incendiary appeals of the federal press, called forth by the action of the democracy upon the Nebraska question, are awakening true men everywhere, from end to end of our broad land, to an appreciation of the interests involved in the coming issue.

We have no fears for New Hampshire. Her democracy have been called upon to deal with recruits to principle before this! Her decisions in the cases of Hale and Atwood are bright spots in her history. The democracy which could throw over its candidate for governor upon the naked issue of the fugitive-slave law, but a few days comparatively before the election, and triumph upon the issue thus raised, with a new candidate, will not falter nor pause when the vital principle of constitutional liberty hangs upon the decision of the day.

"We are sorry to entertain the suspicion that two of the members from this State have seen fit to array themselves against the wishes of the democracy in joining with this hybrid faction. It is true they represent districts with the sentiments of which we are perhaps not fully conversant; but we do democracy by feeling judged by their decisions. And we are the representatives we look them to be? Are they voting with such men as Cass and Douglas and Norcross, or do they feel them to be alien to their district and to the people of the South? Do they leave the feelings of their constituents through the medium of democratic party, or do they seek for them in the inflammatory appeals of the New York Tribune and Independent Democrat? Are they throwing their influence in favor of self-government, or contrary to the letter and spirit of the constitution, do they wish to empower Congress to interfere with the local affairs of the people? And are they not opposing an evident majority to Congress, by lagging with a faction that have time and again shown themselves traitors to the Union, and attempting to accomplish their ends by force, which Jefferson denominated the 'vital principle and the immediate parent of despotism'? Of all this the people must judge. They are in the hands of an intelligent constituency, and we are willing to abide by their decision. But for our part we admire the course pursued by Mr. Hubbard, the representative from this district—and the more so as it contrasts with that of his colleagues. He took a decided stand at the outset in favor of the principles embodied in the Nebraska-Kansas bill, and has maintained his position in the House with a firmness and ability which command the admiration of the democracy of his district. We freely believe that he will be a candidate for reelection next week, and he will be triumphantly returned to his seat upon the merits of his straightforward course at this exciting moment, as well as for his reliability in all crises that occur in the affairs of the State and nation. Messrs. Norris and Williams, our able senators, will be remembered by the democracy of New Hampshire for the noble stand they have taken, and will have their reward in the approval of their constituents."

The indignation of the opponents of the Nebraska bill is represented as unabated. An address to the free States is contemplated, and in the anti-Nebraska convention, gotten up in Washington, by free-soil abolition whigs, a committee was appointed for the purpose of preparing one. Mr. Benton was invited to co-operate, but whether he consents or not is not yet made apparent. The people, however, are not to be gulled by the expressions of a few disappointed politicians. They recognize the success of a constitutional measure, and are ready to abide by it.—Boston Post.

DIGEST OF THE VOTE ON THE NEBRASKA BILL.

The following digest of the vote on the Nebraska bill, made out with much care, will be useful for future reference. If the classification is erroneous in any particular we will be glad to make the correction:

YEAS—FOR THE BILL.
No whigs from non-slaveholding States.
DEMOCRATS FROM NON-SLAVEHOLDING STATES.

Allen, J. O.	Illinois	Lilly	Ohio
Atchison	Missouri	Macdonald	Ohio
Bader	Ohio	McNair	Ohio
Badger	Wisconsin	Miles	Ohio
Benson	Ohio	Smith	Ohio
Brown	Ohio	Stewart	Ohio
Butler	Ohio	Straw	Ohio
Cass	Ohio	Swann	Ohio
Clay	Ohio	Tweed	Ohio
Dawson	Ohio	Valley	Ohio
Douglas	Ohio	Walker	Ohio
Fitzpatrick	Ohio	Westcott	Ohio
Gwin	Ohio	White	Ohio
Hunter	Ohio	Wright	Ohio
Johnson	Ohio		
Jones of Iowa	Ohio		
Jones of Tennessee	Ohio		
Mallory	Ohio		
Mason	Ohio		
Morton	Ohio		
Norris	Ohio		
Pearce	Ohio		
Pettit	Ohio		
Pratt	Ohio		
Rusk	Ohio		
Sebastian	Ohio		
Shields	Ohio		
Sill	Ohio		
Stuart	Ohio		
Thompson of Kentucky	Ohio		
Thompson of New Jersey	Ohio		
Toombs	Ohio		
Toucey	Ohio		
Waller	Ohio		
Williams	Ohio		
Wright	Ohio		

DEMOCRATS FROM SLAVEHOLDING STATES.

Abbe	Ohio	Jones of Iowa	Tenn.
Adams	Ohio	Kidwell	Va.
Allen	Ohio	Lamb	Mo.
Atchison	Ohio	Law	Mo.
Bader	Ohio	May	Mo.
Badger	Ohio	McNair	Ohio
Benson	Ohio	Phillips	Ohio
Brown	Ohio	Reynolds	Ohio
Butler	Ohio	Shaw	Ohio
Cass	Ohio	Stewart	Ohio
Clay	Ohio	Straw	Ohio
Dawson	Ohio	Swann	Ohio
Douglas	Ohio	Tweed	Ohio
Fitzpatrick	Ohio	Valley	Ohio
Gwin	Ohio	Walker	Ohio
Hunter	Ohio	Westcott	Ohio
Johnson	Ohio	White	Ohio
Jones of Iowa	Ohio	Wright	Ohio
Jones of Tennessee	Ohio		
Mallory	Ohio		
Mason	Ohio		
Morton	Ohio		
Norris	Ohio		
Pearce	Ohio		
Pettit	Ohio		
Pratt	Ohio		
Rusk	Ohio		
Sebastian	Ohio		
Shields	Ohio		
Sill	Ohio		
Stuart	Ohio		
Thompson of Kentucky	Ohio		
Thompson of New Jersey	Ohio		
Toombs	Ohio		
Toucey	Ohio		
Waller	Ohio		
Williams	Ohio		
Wright	Ohio		

WHIGS FROM SLAVEHOLDING STATES.

Abercrombie	Ohio	Oliver	Ohio
Adams	Ohio	Prentiss	Ohio
Allen	Ohio	Reynolds	Ohio
Atchison	Ohio	Shaw	Ohio
Bader	Ohio	Stewart	Ohio
Badger	Ohio	Straw	Ohio
Benson	Ohio	Swann	Ohio
Brown	Ohio	Tweed	Ohio
Butler	Ohio	Valley	Ohio
Cass	Ohio	Walker	Ohio
Clay	Ohio	Westcott	Ohio
Dawson	Ohio	White	Ohio
Douglas	Ohio	Wright	Ohio
Fitzpatrick	Ohio		
Gwin	Ohio		
Hunter	Ohio		
Johnson	Ohio		
Jones of Iowa	Ohio		
Jones of Tennessee	Ohio		
Mallory	Ohio		
Mason	Ohio		
Morton	Ohio		
Norris	Ohio		
Pearce	Ohio		
Pettit	Ohio		
Pratt	Ohio		
Rusk	Ohio		
Sebastian	Ohio		
Shields	Ohio		
Sill	Ohio		
Stuart	Ohio		
Thompson of Kentucky	Ohio		
Thompson of New Jersey	Ohio		
Toombs	Ohio		
Toucey	Ohio		
Waller	Ohio		
Williams	Ohio		
Wright	Ohio		

WHIGS FROM NON-SLAVEHOLDING STATES.

Ball	Ohio	Maitland	N. Y.
Benson	Ohio	McNair	N. Y.
Brown	Ohio	Morgan	N. Y.
Butler	Ohio	Norton	N. Y.
Cass	Ohio	Oliver	N. Y.
Clay	Ohio	Prentiss	N. Y.
Dawson	Ohio	Reynolds	N. Y.
Douglas	Ohio	Shaw	N. Y.
Fitzpatrick	Ohio	Stewart	N. Y.
Gwin	Ohio	Straw	N. Y.
Hunter	Ohio	Swann	N. Y.
Johnson	Ohio	Tweed	N. Y.
Jones of Iowa			